REMARKS

Applicant(s) appreciate the Office's review of the present application. In response to the Office Action, the cited references have been reviewed, and the rejections and objections made to the claims by the Examiner have been considered. In order to place the application in condition for allowance, or alternatively in better condition for appeal, claim 25 has been canceled. Therefore, reconsideration of the application in light of the above amendments and the following remarks is respectfully requested.

Statement of Substance of Examiner Interview

Applicants' attorney thanks Examiner for the telephonic interview on 06/14/2003. The following statement is provided in accordance with MPEP 713.04:

- (A) No exhibit was shown nor demonstration conducted.
- (B) Claim 26 was discussed.
- (C) The Sanchez reference (US 5,832,298) was discussed.
- (D) No substantive amendments were proposed.
- (E) Applicants' attorney stated that the claimed structure of a user interface system coupled to a plurality of client computers via a communications network is quite different from Sanchez. After considering Applicants' position, Examiner stated that he still believed that the reference anticipated the limitations of claim 26. Applicants' attorney also asked for a further explanation of how Examiner believes that Sanchez teaches a user profiler configured to construct profiles for the client computers, each profile indicative of client-specific print options, which Examiner provided.
- (F) No other pertinent matters were discussed.
- (G) No agreement was reached.
- (H) The interview was not conducted by electronic mail.

Page 8 of 12

Rejections

Rejection Under 35USC Section 102(b)

Claims 1-4, 6-8, 26, and 30 have been rejected under 35 USC Section 102(b), as being anticipated by U.S. patent 5,832,298 to Sanchez et al. ("Sanchez"). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection and request reconsideration based on features in the claims which are neither disclosed nor suggested in the cited reference.

The rejection of independent claim 1, and its dependent claims 2-4 and 6-8, is respectfully traversed for at least the following reasons. Claim 1 recites:

"1. (Original) A user interface system, comprising:

a register configured to collect resource information from one or more resources coupled to a communications network;

an options module configured to provide resource options based on the collected resource information;

a user profiler configured to construct profiles for clients coupled to the network; and a user interface builder configured to construct user interfaces based on the user profiles and the resource options, wherein the user interface builder may be configured to construct a unique user interface for each of the clients coupled to the network."

In contrast, the Sanchez reference fails to anticipate the essential elements of "a user profiler configured to construct profiles for clients coupled to the network", and "a user interface builder configured to construct ... a unique user interface for each of the clients coupled to the network". None of the portions of the Sanchez reference cited by the Office (col. 2, lines 16-31; col. 11, lines 50-67; Fig. 10; col. 2, lines 35-61; col. 1, lines 31-37) disclose the limitations as claimed by Applicants. While the Sanchez reference may possibly teach some aspects of constructing profiles and constructing user interfaces, Applicants believe that the Sanchez reference does not teach a single user profiler that constructs profiles for more than one network client, nor does it teach a single user interface builder that constructs unique user interfaces for each of the network clients, as is claimed by Applicants. The user interface components of Sanchez (copier UI DLL 65 and fax UI DLL 60 of Fig. 4) are part of printer/fax driver 40 (Fig. 2). One copy of printer/fax driver 40 runs on computing

Page 9 of 12

equipment 11 and constructs the user interface only of computing equipment 11. To construct the user interface of laptop computer 12 requires a different copy of printer/fax driver 40 that runs on laptop computer 12 and constructs the user interface only of laptop computer 12. The Sanchez reference neither teaches nor suggests that a single copy of its printer/fax driver 40, running on one of computers 11,12, could serve to construct user profiles, or build user interfaces, for both computers 11,12. Accordingly, anticipating all the elements of Applicants' claim 1 based on the Sanchez reference could be possible only using impermissible hindsight and in light of Applicants' teachings. Furthermore, since the Sanchez reference teaches that both computing equipment 11 and laptop computer 12 are connected to local area network 10, but fails to teach that its user interface system could run on one computer but construct the user interface on other computers coupled to the network, the Sanchez reference teaches away from Applicants' claimed invention. Therefore, the rejection is improper at least for these reasons and should be withdrawn.

The rejection of independent claim 26, and its dependent claim 30, is respectfully traversed for at least the following reasons. Claim 26 recites:

- "26. (Previously presented) A <u>user interface system</u> adapted for <u>coupling to a plurality</u> of client <u>computers</u> <u>via a communications network</u>, comprising:
- a register configured to collect resource information from one or more resources coupled to the network;
- an options module configured to provide resource options based on the collected resource information;
- a user profiler configured to construct profiles for the client computers, each profile indicative of client-specific print options; and
- a user interface builder configured to construct user interfaces based on the profiles and the resource options, wherein the user interface builder may be configured to construct a customized user interface for each of the client computers, each customized user interface indicative of the client-specific print options associated with a corresponding one of the client computers."

In contrast, the Sanchez reference does not teach a user interface system that is adapted for <u>coupling to a plurality of client computers</u> via a communications network. In addition, the Sanchez reference fails to anticipate the essential elements of "a user profiler configured to construct profiles <u>for the client computers</u>" (plural), and "a user interface

Page 10 of 12

builder configured to construct ... a customized user interface for each of the client computers" (plural). As explained heretofore with regard to claim 1, the Sanchez reference neither teaches nor suggests that a single copy of its printer/fax driver 40 (i.e. its user interface system), running on one of computers 11,12, could serve to construct user profiles, or build user interfaces, for both computers 11,12. Accordingly, anticipating all the elements of Applicants' claim 26 from the Sanchez reference could be possible only using impermissible hindsight and in light of Applicants' teachings, and the Sanchez reference teaches away from Applicants' claimed invention. Therefore, the rejection is improper at least for these reasons and should be withdrawn.

Rejection Under 35USC Section 103

Claim 5 has been rejected under 35 USC Section 103(a), as being unpatentable over U.S. patent 5,832,298 to Sanchez et al. ("Sanchez") in view of U.K. patent application GB 2347766A by Wilson ("Wilson"). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection and request reconsideration based on the dependence of this claim on independent claim 1, whose reasons for allowability over the Sanchez reference have been discussed heretofore and against which the Wilson reference has not been cited. Therefore, the rejection is improper at least for that reason and should be withdrawn.

Claims 27-29 have been rejected under 35 USC Section 103(a), as being unpatentable over U.S. patent 5,832,298 to Sanchez et al. ("Sanchez") in view of U.S. patent 6,232,968 by Alimpich et al. ("Alimpich"). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection and request reconsideration based on the dependence of this claim on independent claim 26, whose reasons for allowability over the Sanchez reference have been discussed heretofore and against which the Alimpich reference has not been cited. Therefore, the rejection is improper at least for that reason and should be withdrawn.

Conclusion

Attorney for Applicant(s) has carefully reviewed each one of the cited references

Page 11 of 12

made of record and not relied upon, and believes that the claims presently on file in the subject application patentably distinguish thereover, either taken alone or in combination with one another.

Therefore, all claims presently on file in the subject application are in condition for immediate allowance, and such action is respectfully requested. If it is felt for any reason that direct communication with Applicant's attorney would serve to advance prosecution of this case to finality, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned Robert C. Sismilich, Esq. at the below-listed telephone number.

AUTHORIZATION TO PAY AND PETITION FOR THE ACCEPTANCE OF ANY NECESSARY FEES

If any charges or fees must be paid in connection with the foregoing communication (including but not limited to the payment of an extension fee or issue fees), or if any overpayment is to be refunded in connection with the above-identified application, any such charges or fees, or any such overpayment, may be respectively paid out of, or into, the Deposit Account No. 08-2025 of Hewlett-Packard Company. If any such payment also requires Petition or Extension Request, please construe this authorization to pay as the necessary Petition or Request which is required to accompany the payment.

Respectfully submitted,

Robert C. Sismilich

Reg. No. 41,314

Attorney for Applicant(s) Telephone: (858) 547-9803

Date:

Hewlett-Packard Company Intellectual Property Administration P.O. Box 272400 Fort Collins, CO 80527-2400

Page 12 of 12